United States
Department of
Agriculture

Office of
Governmental
and Public Affairs

Major News Releases and Speeches

February 27-March 6, 1981

Speeches

U.S. Department of Agriculture • Office of Governmental and Public Affairs

Remarks prepared for delivery by Secretary of Agriculture John R. Block, before the National Farmers Union Convention, Orlando, Florida, March 2, 1981

President Stone, members of the National Farmers Union, thank you very much. It's a pleasure to be with you today and to have this opportunity to come and sell you on a point of view. That's right--a point of view.

I've spoken considerably around the country in this past month. I can tell you that the nation is rife with opinions on specifics of the President's inflation control program, particularly that part dealing with federal budget cuts. But it's struck me lately that the specifics of budget cuts are not really what we're about. What we're about is a broad program that will return to the American people economic health and prosperity and will guarantee this nation a solvent economic future.

It's the responsibility of all of us--those in the private sector as well as those of us in government--to regard the programs that affect our lives and our livelihoods in terms of this larger perspective.

In the case of agriculture, this means many things. It means, for example, that many programs will stay about the same. Economics demands that some be cut and that others possibly be strengthened. For the vast majority, it means a continued strong commitment to their importance and purpose but a shift in financial emphasis from the federal to state, local and private levels.

Regardless of the budget status of individual programs, I want to assure you from the start that the President's program includes a deep concern for the problems of American agriculture. It includes an absolute conviction that what we can do best for all of the people of this nation is to keep agriculture productive, exporting, strong and prosperous.

Whatever budgetary changes are made will be made toward that end.

To view ourselves as part of the overall economic solution, we need only to see ourselves as victims of the general problem.

Agriculture has felt the impact of current economic conditions on expenses and net returns. Farm income was down about 25 percent in 1980 from 1979 to an estimated $23-$25 billion. USDA projects that farm income will increase to about $28-$32 billion in 1981. This is still below the 1979 level and production costs will increase this year about 10 - 12 percent for all of agriculture.

The inflation situation is critical. And a critical situation demands a drastic--and, more important, a unified--response.

Probably the most obvious, and certainly the most immediate, forum for assessing budget impacts on agriculture is the upcoming farm bill.

My position on various programs follows my philosophy and that of President Reagan that free enterprise and a marketplace that sets its own price levels will foster a stronger economy.

I am against the target price concept. Because target prices are direct outlays from the federal treasury, I can neither justify nor defend them publicly.

Because loan programs, on the other hand, are repaid, I support a modest increase in the wheat and feed grain price support loan rates under

the 1981 bill. It's the position of this administration that the farmer-owned grain reserve well serves farmers and consumers, but that some simplification is in order. We are reviewing all aspects of the program, including a reserve entry price or special loan rate that encourages farmers to place grain into the reserve. We're also looking at the trigger prices and how they should be adjusted over time to give the market ample room to function.

I can't give you specifics yet of changes in most commodity programs. Reviews are now underway and it's likely that we will propose some changes.

Just over a week ago, I asked Congress for authority to forego the April 1 adjustment in dairy price support levels. Let me assure you that I strongly believe not only in the dairy support program, but in the historical need for a sound program.

Right now, to maintain the delicate supply-demand balance, the dairy program needs a little assist. Since 1979, the semi-annual adjustments have led to milk supplies that far outpace demand. We

figure that an April 1 increase would create a surplus of over 11 billion pounds costing taxpayers $1.9 billion. Our estimates show that we would save about $138 million this year by maintaining the current support level without the April increase.

While economics demands that some programs be cut, it also makes it prudent to maintain or even increase spending levels for others.

USDA projects a record $47 billion in agricultural exports this year, 16 percent above last year's $40 billion level. With imports estimated at $18 billion, agriculture should contribute an all-time high of $29 billion to the national balance of payments. This trade buys us imported goods and generates millions of jobs, on the farm and throughout the economy. That's why programs that expand commercial exports will get relatively favorable treatment in the budget review.

With increasing farm exports, greater world demand, and a stronger national economy, we'll need to produce more in this decade. But productivity depends on research and that depends on money. A reasonable investment in research dollars will pay off in production, greater domestic supplies and increased international sales.

Now that I've discussed programs that will get some cuts and others that justify maintaining the financial status quo, I want to mention briefly one extremely important subject that merits increased attention at state and local levels.

That's the matter of our prime agricultural lands.

I believe that the current situation is nothing less than a crisis in the making and I tell you what I told delegates to the National Agricultural Lands Conference in Chicago three weeks ago. The National Agricultural Lands study has built a strong case for establishing a national policy for protecting good agricultural land. I support such a policy. I support taking action now. And in this time of severe fiscal restraint, I support the study's recommendation that state and local governments take the lead. Federal agencies will be there for technical support.

There you have it--three different types of agricultural programs and three different emphases. Whether we cut or add funds, or switch the burden of responsibility to the state and local level, the aim of this administration is not to please. It's to keep agriculture strong and productive because that's the very best we can do for all of the people

and, always, to keep our sights on the big picture.
Thank you.

#

Remarks prepared for delivery by Secretary of Agriculture John R. Block, before the Joint Agricultural Consultative Committee at the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Room 218-A, Washington, D.C., March 4, 1981

It is a pleasure for me to meet with this distinguished committee just prior to your first travel as a group to Nigeria. I consider the Joint Agricultural Consultative Committee, and the purpose for which it was founded, to be in the best interest of the United States, the African nation of Nigeria, and private business and industry in both countries.

This cooperative venture is a first. It marks the first time that the private agribusiness sector in this country has joined forces with the U.S. Department of Agriculture in quite this way to assist with agricultural development in another nation and expanding trade with that country. It represents a process that most effectively combines the resources of the public and private sectors to their mutual benefit while providing needed assistance to another nation. The results of this endeavor may well lead to similar cooperative ventures in the years ahead.

As these ventures develop throughout the world, it is important to recognize that our agricultural and trade development projects with other nations will be linked to our relations with those countries. Priorities will be given to nations that show evidence of support for the goals and objectives of the United States. The administration takes the view that the limited resources available to us at this time need to be used wisely.

Let me say, that I, as Secretary of Agriculture, am personally committed to realistic programs to achieve these goals and objectives, and in the process, broaden the ability of the U.S. to increase its agricultural markets abroad. We have made the development and expansion of markets for U.S. products as one of the primary goals of

our agricultural policy. In Nigeria, we will work to do this within the context of that nation's development objectives.

As you know, increased exports of U.S. agricultural products provide significant benefits to our nation's farmers, to the entire agricultural industry, and to the nation as a whole. The growth in agricultural exports has an important role in helping to offset this nation's continuing unfavorable balance of payments--a deficit caused, in large part, by sharply escalating costs of imported petroleum. We face the same problem in the years immediately ahead, and cooperative ventures such as this one with Nigeria are a part of the solution.

The value of U.S. agricultural exports has increased by eight times since 1964--to a 1980 level above $40 billion. These exports resulted in a favorable balance of trade in agricultural products of some $23 billion. That's good business, both for our economy and for our taxpayers. I'd like to see that figure improved, and we believe it will rise to around $47 billion this fiscal year.

Government to government relationships and specific agreements, such as this one with Nigeria, can open doors for U.S. producer and agribusiness groups and make the task of establishing a business, or new markets, much smoother.

The USDA is one of the principal sources of agricultural expertise in the world. Much of the research information needed to make informed judgments about business and export opportunities in foreign nations is already available, or can be obtained readily by the USDA.

The Office of International Cooperation and Development is charged with coordinating the cooperative venture in Nigeria on behalf of USDA.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture has sent a team of soil scientists to Nigeria to train technicians in soil survey activities under a $1 million contract with the Nigerian government. Good soil information, is as you know essential to good agricultural production. This type of support from the department to the U.S. private sector and to Nigeria greatly enhances our mutual interests in agricultural trade and investments.

USDA's Foreign Agricultural Service is opening an Agricultural Trade Office in Lagos. The U.S. State Department, Department of Commerce, the Export Import Bank, the Overseas Private Investment

Corporation, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and other groups and organizations are also involved in development activities in Nigeria.

Nigeria itself has been similarly active. A group of individuals representing the government and private sector will be your counterparts there. They will meet with you when you visit Nigeria in the near future.

It is my understanding that President Shagari has made the improvement of agriculture in Nigeria the number one priority in his nation's Fourth Development Plan. President Shagari has committed the sum of $2 billion for agricultural sectors, including water resources, in his proposed 1981 budget. He has also taken steps to improve the business climate for investment in Nigeria.

The development of new markets for U.S. agricultural products is of critical importance to the nation's economic well being. This is the basic reason for USDA to assist interested developing nations to improve their economic well being. Experience has indicated that as per capita income rises in developing nations, so does their ability to buy agricultural products.

The United States, through its Department of Agriculture, is in a good position to play a leading role in international cooperation and development to help resolve agricultural problems. The cooperative effort undertaken by USDA and American agribusiness in Nigeria is an excellent example of the kind of cooperation that will be needed to meet the basic food requirements in the years ahead.

Press Releases

U.S. Department of Agriculture • Office of Governmental and Public Affairs

FOWL PLAGUE EXPERTS TO MEET AT BELTSVILLE, MD., APRIL 22-24

WASHINGTON, March 2--The world's foremost experts on fowl plague--avian influenza--will meet April 22-24 at Beltsville, Md., to pool information about this highly destructive disease of poultry and other birds, a U.S. Department of Agriculture veterinarian said today.

The international symposium is being sponsored by the U.S. Animal Health Association, USDA, the U.S. State Department and several poultry industry organizations.

According to I. L. Peterson, poultry veterinarian with USDA's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, participants are expected from the United States, Canada, Australia, Mexico, France, Germany, Hong Kong, Israel, Italy, Japan, United Kingdom, Belgium and Czechoslovakia.

Fowl plague is one of the most potentially destructive diseases affecting poultry and other birds, Peterson said. "As in human influenza, the causative virus is constantly changing, which makes the disease capable of causing widespread losses in susceptible populations before it can be brought under control.

"This meeting is aimed at establishing understanding of the disease and the roles of research and regulatory animal health officials and scientists in finding the most practical methods for controlling it."

The symposium, which will be held in building 005 of USDA's Agricultural Research Center, is open to the public. Reservations may be made by contacting the U. S. Animal Health Association at 6924 Lakeside Ave., suite 205, Richmond, Va. 23228.

#

SECRETARY BLOCK TO ADDRESS U.S. BUSINESSMEN AIDING NIGERIA'S AGRICULTURE

WASHINGTON, March 2--Secretary of Agriculture John Block will meet March 4 with representatives of U.S. corporations, cooperatives and foundations to discuss how the U.S Department of Agriculture can encourage greater involvement of the private sector in international agricultural development.

Block will address the U.S. members of the Joint Agricultural Consultative Committee for Nigeria who are in Washington to plan a meeting with their Nigerian counterparts in Lagos later this spring. Former Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman is chairman of the committee.

Block said the committee will serve as a model for private sector involvement in agricultural development projects in other foreign countries. The committee is an outgrowth of an agreement between the United States and Nigeria negotiated last year. USDA's Office of International Cooperation and Development is responsible for coordinating the agreement.

Firms represented at the Washington meeting include Archer Daniels Midland; Business International; Carnation International; Coca Cola; Control Data Corporation; Farmland Industries, Ford Motor Company; Gold Kist Incorporated; Land O' Lakes, Inc.; Leva, Hawes, Symington, Marion, and Oppenheimer; Multinational Agribusiness Systems, Inc.; Occidental Petroleum; Pfizer International Incorporated; Pioneer Hi-Bred International; Ralston Purina Company; Uncle Ben's Inc.; Whitakker Corporation; and Wind Baron Corporation.

Block said committee members hope greater private sector involvement in agricultural development will eventually pay off in terms of enhanced contracts with the Nigerian private sector and expanded exports. Currently the United States is running a $9.9 billion annual trade deficit with Nigeria.

The agreement already has led to the direct purchase of $1 million worth of technical assistance from USDA, Block said.

#

USDA DEFERS DECISION ON PCB PROPOSAL

WASHINGTON, March 3--The U.S. Department of Agriculture will defer the final decision on its proposal to ban liquid polychlorinated biphenyls (PCB) from federally-inspected meat, poultry and egg products plants while the impact of a related court decision is studied, a USDA administrator said today.

Donald L. Houston, administrator for USDA's Food Safety and Quality Service, said USDA, the Environmental Protection Agency and the Food and Drug Administration last summer proposed banning PCB from electrical equipment used in food manufacturing and storage plants.

"Those proposals were based, in part, on existing Environmental Protection Agency regulations," Houston said.

"Last October," said Houston, "the U.S. District Court of Appeals in Washington, D.C., ruled in a suit brought by the Environmental Defense Fund that EPA's existing regulations were in violation of the Toxic Substances Control Act."

"The court said evidence did not support EPA's decision to exclude from regulation all materials with PCB levels below 50 parts per million. EPA is now negotiating the matter with the litigants," he said.

"Since the final resolution of EPA's 50 ppm rule affects FSQS' proposal banning PCB-containing equipment, the agency intends to set its proposal aside until that issue is resolved," Houston said. Both EPA and FDA are taking similar actions on their proposals.

FSQS proposed banning PCB-containing equipment from meat, poultry and egg products plants May 9 last year. The agency first gave the public 60 days to comment on the proposal, but then extended the comment period several times, Houston said.

Last December, the agency finally set March 4, 1981, as the closing date for comments.

EPA and FDA announced similar PCB proposals last summer, and they similarly will extend their comment periods and deferred action on the PCB proposal, Houston said.

USDA will not issue a final PCB regulation until another opportunity for officially submitting comments is provided. In the meantime, however, FSQS is still seeking public comments. Written comments should be sent to Annie Johnson, FSQS, USDA, room

2637, South Agriculture Bldg., Washington, D.C., 20250.

Notice of this action is scheduled to be published in the March 6 Federal Register, available in most local libraries.

#

SECOND ESTIMATE OF 1981 MEAT IMPORTS REDUCED

WASHINGTON, March 3--Secretary of Agriculture John Block today announced President Reagan will not impose quotas on meat imports during the second quarter of this year, and predicted quotas would not be necessary for the rest of 1981.

Block said the U.S. Department of Agriculture's second quarterly estimate of 1981 U.S. meat imports indicates the United States will import 1.402 billion pounds of meat covered by the Meat Import Act of 1979.

This act requires the president to restrict imports of certain meats--primarily beef and veal--if USDA estimates imports of those meats will equal or exceed 110 percent of a stated level.

"Based on today's estimate, there is no need to impose import restrictions during the quarter beginning April 1," Block said. "Our analysis of conditions in this country and abroad affecting meat imports strongly suggests there will be no need for import restrictions for the remainder of the year."

USDA makes a new estimate of meat imports before each calendar quarter. For 1981, quotas would be required if imports are estimated to equal or exceed 1.447 billion pounds. The USDA estimate released today is 45 million pounds below that level, Block said.

Last November, USDA estimated 1.458 billion pounds of meat would be imported in 1981. This estimate was 11 million pounds above the trigger level.

On Nov. 28, former President Carter announced his intention to implement--and then suspend--meat import limitations under provisions in the law. A 30-day public comment period was provided in accordance with the act.

While the comments were being reviewed and analyzed, first by the Carter administration and then by the current administration, USDA

received new data on the effects of the drought in Australia. These data indicated a substantial reduction in the export availability of beef from that country during 1981.

Australia normally supplies the United States with about half the imported meat subject to the act. Although a drought was in progress in Australia at the time of the first estimate, its impact on production and exports was more severe than earlier forecast, further depleting stock inventory levels in 1981, Block said.

Despite some rain during December through February, rangeland conditions, particularly over the central and southeastern cattle producing areas, are still generally in only fair to poor condition, Block said. Also, he said, lower U.S. prices, higher interest rates and a strong Australian dollar further reduced incentives to produce meat exports for the U.S. market.

#

USDA EXTENDS COMMENT PERIOD ON PEANUT STANDARDS TO APRIL 2

WASHINGTON, March 3--The comment period has been extended from March 5 until April 2 on a U.S. Department of Agriculture proposal to combine three separate peanut standards into a single U.S. standard for grades of shelled peanuts, said Donald Houston, administrator of USDA's Food Safety and Quality Service.

"The Southeastern Peanut Association asked for the extension to provide additional time for peanut industry representatives to meet and resolve industry differences over the proposal, which was published Dec. 14," Houston said.

"The proposed changes would combine the three current U.S. grade standards for shelled Virginia, Runner and Spanish type peanuts into a single U.S. grade standard," Houston said. "The grades are used only by peanut producers and manufacturers for commercial trading purposes and are not used at the retail level for consumers."

The new grading standards were requested by industry groups to make the standards more consistent with marketing practices and to promote uniformity of requirements in the three standards, said

Houston.

USDA asked for further comments on the proposal on Feb. 3. The notice of the extension of the comment period will be published in the March 3 Federal Register.

Written comments should be sent by April 2 to the executive secretariat, Attn: Annie Johnson, 2637-S, USDA, Washington, D.C., 20250.

USDA's Food Safety and Quality Service establishes grade standards and provides grading service for many products. Use of the service is voluntary and is paid for by the user.

#

USDA CALLS FOR COMMENTS ON BANKRUPT GRAIN ELEVATOR ISSUE

WASHINGTON, March 5--The public is asked to submit comments and recommendations to the U.S. Department of Agriculture on how best to protect the interests of both farmers and the government when dealing with grain elevators that go bankrupt.

According to Edward Hews, acting administrator of USDA's Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, a USDA working group will consider the comments during its current review of all existing laws and regulations dealing with the question of grain ownership at insolvent elevators.

Hews said public comments are especially important because there are no current studies or reports directly related to this matter. The group's study will not be restricted to bankrupt elevators but also will consider possible actions that can be taken to avoid insolvency, he said.

Comments should be sent to Merrill Marxman, elevator task force working group, Room 5959 South bldg., ASCS-USDA, P.O. Box 2415, Washington, D.C., 20013.

#

CHERRY GROWERS AND HANDLERS TO VOTE ON MARKETING ORDER IN MARCH

WASHINGTON, March 5--Red tart cherry growers in eight states will vote March 22-31 on whether to continue the federal marketing order regulating the handling of their crop, a U.S. Department of Agriculture official said today.

Tart cherry growers and processors in Michigan, New York, Wisconsin, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Virginia, West Virginia and Maryland who produced cherries for market in canned, frozen, or other processed form from May 1 to Dec. 31, 1980, are eligible to vote in the USDA referendum, said William J. Doyle, produce marketing official with USDA's Agricultural Marketing Service.

Doyle said the marketing order would continue unless more than half the growers or handlers who vote want it ended.

"The 50-percent requirement for growers can be based either on numbers of growers voting or on production they account for," Doyle said. "Opposing handlers would have to account for more than 50 percent of the cherries processed under the marketing order from last season's crop."

A provision of the marketing order calls for a referendum to be held every five years as a means of determining whether growers and handlers want to continue the program, Doyle said.

The marketing order authorizes that a reserve pool of cherries be set up during years of excessive production. Frozen cherries from this pool are returned to marketing channels during times of low production. Doyle said the pool arrangement, which is being used this year, prevents shortages and gluts in marketing supplies of tart cherries.

Ballots and voting instructions will be mailed by the Agricultural Marketing Service to all eligible cherry growers and handlers by March 22. Any eligible voter who does not receive one should contact either Raymond C. Martin III, AMS, rm. 2532-S., USDA, Washington, D.C., 20250; phone: (202) 447-5127; or Delbert D Rasmussen, Cherry Administrative Board, P.O. Box 187, Watervliet, Mich., 49098; phone: (616) 463-3175.

#

KHAPRA BEETLE INSPECTION PROGRAM DRAWS TO A CLOSE

WASHINGTON, March 5--All 18 isolated, nationwide infestations of khapra beetles--the world's most destructive pests of stored grain and grain products--have been eradicated or are slated for fumigation, according to a U.S. Department of Agriculture official.

In 11 instances, the pests were fumigated and eradicated either by the private owners, states, or by USDA, leaving only seven facilities untreated, said Ron Johnson, staff officer for USDA's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service. Those seven will be under strict quarantine until they are treated.

"Luckily, the low-level beetle infestations were not grain-related this time," said Johnson. The pests were found instead in spices, burlap bags, and in two food-related establishments.

"The seven remaining cases will be dealt with when the weather conditions are more favorable," Johnson said. According to USDA emergency program officials, the businesses are located in cold northern climates which, this time of year, remain below 40 degrees Fahrenheit (4.5 degrees Celsius)--a temperature at which fumigation with methyl bromide is ineffective.

"For the fumigant to work," Johnson said, "the temperature should be above 40 degrees--with 60 degrees the desirable temperature."

USDA inspectors discovered the pests during initial inspections in typical haunts: dark and dry crevices, burlap bags, rat bait, and in and under cardboard boxes. The beetle is only 1/4 inch long in its larval stage, which is the only stage that is destructive.

The khapra beetle, which is a native of India, causes millions of dollars of damage annually worldwide by eating stored grains and cereal products. The pest "hitchhikes" to other locations. The current invasion was first detected in a New Jersey spice company in October 1980.

The resulting inspections of approximately 200 businesses not only involved the search for the pest, but also "tracing back" of many establishments connected with the affected sites as well as checking up on companies doing the same type of business as those found to be infested.

Owners of burlap bag companies doing business with infested spice companies were inspected by the USDA. Other burlap bag factories in

the area which were not known to do business with the affected facility were also checked as a precautionary measure, Johnson said.

Khapra beetles were last eradicated from the U.S. in 1966, although an infested warehouse was found and fumigated in 1978 in Linden, N.J. Losses to this prolific and destructive pest can range from 2 percent to total destruction in a vast variety of stored products.

#

USDA SETS RULES FOR RELEASING MARES FROM QUARANTINE

WASHINGTON, March 5--New federal regulations for testing and treating mares infected with or exposed to contagious equine metritis (CEM) may help 89 mares in Kentucky and Missouri gain release from quarantine, U.S. Department of Agriculture officials said today.

John K. Atwell, acting deputy administrator of USDA's Animal and Plant Helath Inspection Service, said these Thoroughbred and Trakehner mares have been quarantined since CEM outbreaks occurred. Until now there was no approved system of testing and treating the mares--79 in Kentucky since 1978 and 10 in Missouri since 1979--that would adequately demonstrate freedom from the genital infection.

"A key element in the required procedure is the surgical removal of the clitoral sinuses from quarantined mares," Atwell said. "This is called a clitoral sinusectomy. The clitoral sinuses have been found to be the sites where CEM bacteria are most likely to remain after acute infection. They are the most difficult to test and treat."

To find which mares still harbor CEM bacteria and require further treatment, USDA officials are requiring bacterial cultures from swab specimens collected before surgery and from the excised tissues.

"After survey, the mares must be aseptically cleansed and treated intensively for five days," Atwell said. "A series of bacterial cultures are then taken at intervals of at least seven days. In the case of pregnant mares, both the mare and the foal must test negative for CEM."

Horses that complete this procedure and are found negative to CEM will be released from quarantine, Atwell said. Surgery and treatment

must be under the direction of a USDA-accredited veterinarian and specimens must be submitted to a state or federal animal disease diagnostic laboratory.

CEM is a transmissable venereal disease of horses that directly infects only mares. Stallions may be mechanical carriers of the bacterial infection; however, they can be rendered free of the disease by thorough scrubbing and cleaning of the external genitals. First discovered in 1977, CEM is considered to exist in Australia, Belgium, Federal Republic of Germany, France, Ireland, Italy, Japan and the United Kingdom.

Today's action is an emergency measure to relieve restrictions affecting the 1981 Thoroughbred breeding season, Atwell said, and is effective immediately. Public comment on these regulations may be submitted for review until May 5 to the deputy administrator for veterinary services, APHIS, USDA, 6505 Belcrest Rd., Hyattsville, Md., 20782.

#

PSEUDORABIES INCREASING, BUT AT SLOWER RATE, ACCORDING TO USDA STUDY

WASHINGTON, March 5--The incidence of pseudorabies in swine has increased substantially since 1974, but at a slower rate over the past three years, according to a U.S. Department of Agriculture survey.

Testing of swine blood samples over a six-week period showed an 8.39 percent level of pseudorabies, compared with 3.73 percent found after a similar survey in 1977-78 and 0.56 percent in a 1974 survey.

Pseudorabies--also called Aujeszky's disease, mad itch in cattle and infectious bulbar paralysis--is a virus disease that primarily affects swine. Death losses are highest among young pigs. It is often fatal when it spreads to cattle, sheep, wildlife and dogs. The disease does not affect humans.

Jim Downard, a veterinarian with USDA's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, said the findings must be viewed with caution because the surveys may be biased by seasonal differences, increased use of vaccine and other factors.

"Tests cannot differentiate between vaccinated animals and those that are infected," he said. "No vaccines were available in 1974. And although USDA-licensed vaccines were being used during both of the latter surveys, they were used much more extensively during the past year or so."

Downard credits the slowing down of the rate of increase over the past three years to greater producer awareness of the disease and to enactment of state and federal movement regulation, along with use of state quarantines on infected herds.

On May 17, 1979, federal regulations went into effect requiring that breeding stock be tested and found negative. On July 1, 1980, feeder pigs either had to be tested and found negative or originate in a state that has authority to quarantine herds where the disease is diagnosed or suspected.

The survey results will be used as an aid in estimating what the disease costs the swine industry, Downard said. This information is vital to help producers and state-federal animal health officials in formulating programs for the control and eradication of pseudorabies.

Data obtained from the current survey plus information on the costs to producers from pseudorabies will be presented to the Pseudorabies Ad Hoc Advisory Committee on March 10--prior to the American Pork Congress in Kansas City, Mo., Downard said.

#